



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,849	01/22/2002	Joseph Convery		5026

7590 07/07/2003  
JOSEPH CONVERY  
621 COLFORD AVE.  
COLLINGSWOOD, NJ 08108

EXAMINER

LIEU, JULIE BICHNGOC

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2636

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/053,849

Applicant(s)

CONVERY, JOSEPH

Examiner

Julie Lieu

Art Unit

2632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claim language is not clear as to what is "wireless indicator means of said activated audible alarm". Perhaps it should be rephrased as "wireless means for indicating that said audible alarm has been activated after the termination of said audible alarm."

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 2632

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markwell et al.

(US Patent No. 6,078,269).

Claim 1:

Markwell et al. discloses an alarm network (fig. 1) for detection of smoke or toxic gas or fire or other abnormal environmental conditions, comprising:

- a. Two or more alarm devices 20, 20A, 20B, and 20C, shown in fig. 1, each comprising an audible alarm, a user selectable coded radio frequency transmitter, a user selectable coded radio frequency receiver (col. 6 lines 39-46)
- b. Each alarm device comprising means, controller 35, to activate an audible alarm, means to activate the RF transmitter when the abnormal environmental conditions sensed by the sensor means, means to activate the audible alarm when the coded RF alarm is received by the RF receiver for other alarm device in the alarm network (col. 4, second paragraph)
- c. Each alarm device further comprising time delay means 36 to eliminate false alarm.

Markwell uses timer 36 as an hold-off timer to avoid message collision. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that the timer at the same time functions as a

Art Unit: 2632

false alarm reducer since the time delay feature would automatically reduces possibility of receive signals of other devices outside the alarm network.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,078,269) in view of Sipp (US Patent Application No. 2002/0126016).

Claim 2:

Markwell fails to disclose using a wireless means to disable emission of audible alarm, to disable transmission of RF alarm messages, and to disable reception if RF alarms messages. Nonetheless, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, by the time the invention was made, to incorporate a remote control unit in the system of Marwell's as taught in similar environmental alarm detection system of Sipp's wherein each remotely controlled smoke detector can be selectively controlled with a smoke detector to adjust for sensitivity or alternately, disabled. See abstract in Sipp. This is because remote control feature would allow the system to be conveniently controlled by a user as desired.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

2. Claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

No prior arts have been found to teach wireless means for indicating that audiblle alarm of the alarm device after the termination of the audible alarm.

Art Unit: 2632

*Conclusion*

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Acevedo, US Patent No. 6,420,973, discloses a wireless smoke detection system.

Nestbit et al., US Patent No. 4,904,988, discloses a toy with smoke detector network.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julie Lieu whose telephone number is 703-308-6738. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thursday, 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Wu can be reached on 703-308-6730. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Julie Lieu  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2632

jl  
June 29, 2003